

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume II, No. 2

February 23, 1942

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Civil Liberties in Wartime

CHRISTIANS have a heavy responsibility in the never-ending struggle to maintain and extend civil liberties. They often exhaust that responsibility, it is to be feared, by congratulating themselves that they live in a country which guarantees religious freedom. They need never take refuge in the catacombs nor need Jews hide in the ghetto. Father Divine may be hailed as God and Judge Rutherford (peace to his soul!) may proclaim the end of all the Churches. In spite of sporadic outbreaks against Catholics, Mormons, Jews and other minorities men have for the most part been free to worship as they choose.

That is all to the good. But this religious liberty cannot be safeguarded if it is treated in isolation. It is an integral part of that pattern of life which we count as free. It stands or falls with the whole fabric of the democratic process. The liberties listed in the Bill of Rights are not, as the 18th century phrases might suggest, a bundle of separate gifts of the Creator. They are aspects of a fundamental social relationship which in Harold Laski's happy phrase enables men "to be without a sense of frustration in realms they deem significant."

They are political, not religious concepts. But they look towards creating a social order the same in kind as that of which Christianity dreams. They assume dignity in human life, worth in human ideals. They look to conference, discussion, the clash of opinion as the process of sound social achievement. They find truth by the trial and error method. They would endeavor to protect for every man the 'realms he deems significant.' In all that they reflect obviously and precisely the principle and method of Christian democracy. They do precisely what Christians acting normally within the Christian community would try to do. 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is—there is liberty.' The springs of this liberty are in God. The sustaining will is God's will. The free world we desire does not need the Christian faith to make it seem desirable nor to reveal that only on the basis of what we call Christian principles can any social

order show relative permanence. Anyone can see that—but the troubled and disillusioned world of today does make it pretty clear that only as men believe that those principles of the free life are rooted in God can they survive crises, show power, become dynamic and creative. "All men are endowed by their creator,"—so wrote Jefferson, so the men who built the Nation believed and so we Christians believe today. We stress again therefore the heavy responsibility of Christians for the safe-guarding of civil liberties and for the steady increase of the area in which they are effective.

This responsibility becomes acute in war-time. Some curtailment of liberty is then necessary. Information cannot be given to the enemy. Freedom of movement of occupation, of recreation is restricted. The conditions of modern total war have deprived men of the long-cherished liberty to decide whether or not to enlist. The draft catches everyone in its net. Food may be rationed; assemblies and crowds prohibited and a host of other ordinary freedoms done away. It is not in these areas that the danger lies. It comes from the panicky fear which sweeps the crowd, engulfs unpopular minorities, loses perspective, forgets that the thing which counts in making a free world is the freedom of the few, not of the many. No one who lived through it can forget the excesses of 1917 and the following years.

This time we must prevent such happenings. We start with the advantage of a Department of Justice which believes in the Bill of Rights and proposes to restrain, not aggravate, hysteria. But we must remember the Palmer raids, the wholesale warrants, the illegalities and the sufferings of the ignorant and innocent. We have their counterpart in the irresponsibilities of the Dies Committee, the bills proposing mass deportations and concentration camps, the attempts to revoke honestly obtained citizenship. Of the last the Schneidemann case is an ominous sign.

Guilt by association is revived for members of the Communist party. Guilt by heritage is a new men-

ace. American-born citizens are dismissed because their parents were born in what are now enemy countries. Legislation is offered which would go far beyond even the ill-fated laws of 1798, or those equally dangerous of 1918, and permit the mind-reading of the court and not the "immediate and present danger" to be the ground of conviction. War opens a wide field for anti-labor legislation aiming at unionism under pretext of keeping war industries at work.

All these movements and many others strike at the heart of a free democracy. Every good citizen must take warning here. But the burden rests most heavily upon the Christian. Can there be any doubt of it? To him have been entrusted the oracles of God; to him given the planting and nurturing of the faith which knows that the roots of our liberties are in God. He must widen, not narrow, the areas in which they are effective. He must deepen understanding. He must not dodge issues. He must not block the free play of criticism even in wartime.

It is a solemn duty which rests upon the free nations today. They must win the war. They must win the peace—yes! but they cannot win the peace save as the free spirit grows stronger among them, as men learn to give to one another the right to live and work in those realms they deem significant. It is a solemn duty and who among the citizens of these free nations have more responsibility than Christians to see that it is done?

Russia's Partnership in War and Peace

THE success of the Russian armies this winter has aroused the apprehensions of many hearts in both Europe and America. Nothing is said in public, but if one has one's ears to the ground not a few rumblings are discernible. The fearful are presumably aware of the fact that without the Russian success we should face the alternative of either defeat or an indeterminable war. But even this knowledge does not quiet their fears.

There are reports that in due time the German army will make overtures to the more conservative forces of the western world and will seek to secure a generous peace at the price of the overthrow of Hitler, hoping that the fear of the spread of Communism will dispose the western democracies favorably toward such proposals.

These fears cannot be quieted by denying obvious facts. Some of the fears are aroused in the hearts of the pious who detest Russian atheism. Others fear Russia primarily because of her socialized property; and still others are particularly worried about the po-

litical dictatorship of Russia, so similar to the Nazi dictatorship. It is of course perfectly true that the ideological differences between Russia and the western democracies are enormous. While these differences may not be as much to the disadvantage of Russia as all nations tend to assume in their pride, it is certainly foolish to deny that Russia has tried to uproot the Christian religion and that democratic liberties have not existed there for a long time, no matter what may be written in the Russian constitution.

It would nevertheless be catastrophic if these fears were allowed to determine our foreign policy. It is fortunate that there is now no indication that either Churchill or Roosevelt is moved by them. It would be catastrophic not only from the standpoint of war strategy, but from the standpoint of the quality of the peace which is to come out of the war.

The latter consideration requires special elucidation. No matter what constitutional forms may be adopted for the international order after the war, nothing can prevent the victorious nations from possessing a virtual hegemony in the organization of that peace. If Russia had not been drawn into a war, a victory of the United Nations would have been extremely unlikely; but even if it had eventuated, it would have had two very great weaknesses. The one is that it would have established a purely Anglo-American hegemony. The second is that any peace arrangements would have been subject to a Russian veto. Hitler drew Russia out of her semi-Asiatic isolation and brought her back into the western system of nations. By being a partner to any peace arrangements, the threat of another conflict will be avoided. But it is even more important that Russia will be a counterbalance to purely Anglo-Saxon interests and will therefore tend to make for a better peace.

If we are unable to admit this we simply prove that we are not able to estimate the temptations to imperial exploitation which a victory offers any nation or group of nations, no matter what its pretensions to, or achievements of, virtue. The defects of Russian domestic politics do not alter this function of Russia in post-war reconstruction at all. It is in fact important to recognize that the quality of balance and harmony achieved by a community of nations is not absolutely determined by the internal structure of the various nations involved in the community. That is why it is idle to speak of a union of only democratic nations after the war. Geographic and other considerations are more important than internal structure, however desirable it may be in the long run to achieve a common level of democratic culture in all nations involved in such a community.

We cannot be certain of course that Russia may not seek to exploit her victory. There are fears upon the continent that she desires to establish a military overlordship over a defeated Germany as well as over eastern Europe. But there are strong reasons for discounting such fears. The first is that Russia, as every other victorious nation, will be too exhausted by the war to court fresh military adventures. The second is that Communism as an imperialistic religion is probably a spent force. It may be true that a Russian victory will shed a certain glow over the sorry realities of a discredited Communistic movement and may revive its waning prestige. These things are possible. Almost anything is possible in our sorry world. But they are extremely unlikely.

It is more probable that Russia will be quite prepared to enter into genuine constitutional arrange-

ments with the other victorious nations. She was ready to do that once before. There is, in fact, not the slightest evidence that Russia is given to military imperialism, however imperialistic its dreams of world revolution may have been. If she does enter such a post-war order it is also probable that her internal policy will be leavened by influences from the western democracies; for the present partnership is bound to dissolve some fears and misunderstandings. It is not even inconceivable that we might learn something from Russia.

But whatever the probabilities are (and history is too full of surprises to justify many prophecies), we have to hope for the best, because any other course but one of fullest cooperation in war and in peace is a threat both to a certain victory and to a durable peace.

Relation of the Christian Faith to Democracy

FRANCIS P. MILLER

WHAT men believe about God and man profoundly affects the character of their institutions. At the same time, men's institutions condition the character of their beliefs. If the content of men's religious faith and the purposes of their social and political procedures do not agree, men will either change their social procedures or in time lose their faith. In other words, over a long period a rough approximation exists between forms of government and the content of religious belief.

This is particularly true in countries where the Christian faith can be freely proclaimed, and where there is no prohibition against attempts to practice the Christian ethic. The Christian faith is rooted in the belief that a Person is the ultimate reality of the Universe, that this Person is known to the world through Jesus Christ, and that this Person has the first word and the last word to say about human history. Because the Christian believes that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, he utterly rejects the notion that God operates exclusively in a realm separate from the material order of this world. On the contrary, he knows that God has invaded this material world and is at work in it creating forms and instruments through which to express His purposes. God is at work upon the raw material of individual life. He is also at work through man upon the patterns of corporate existence—upon the patterns and procedures of corporate religious activity, of corporate political activity and of corporate economic activity.

What is true of the work of the Creator is also true of the work of the Creature. The man of faith

is compelled because of his faith to try to mould his own personal life and the corporate life in which he shares to correspond as nearly as possible with the ultimate reality in which he believes. He knows that faith without works is dead. And he hopes that the authentic quality of his works will call the attention of other men to the object of faith which inspired them. The Christian ethic, clothed in flesh and blood or dynamically expressed through living forms of social relationships, does in fact throw light upon the nature of the God from worship of whom the ethic is derived.

Men who practice the Christian ethic, therefore, naturally endeavor to fashion the structure of their society by the specifications of the Kingdom of God. The fact that these efforts are never more than partially successful in no way detracts from their significance. As a direct result of the striving of men of faith over a period of many centuries forms of government have been created which represent an attempt to express, however imperfectly, the values of the Christian way of life. These crude approximations are known in the modern world as democratic forms of government.

There is, in fact, a definite correlation between the practice of the Christian ethic and the maintenance of democratic government. No one knows this better than Hitler. Organic correlation exists because of what the Christian ethic asserts about the nature of man, and his role on this planet. The Christian view of man is that, earthbound as he is, he can here and now acknowledge and affirm his citizenship in the King-

dom of God. That is the most revolutionary doctrine ever announced. It means that this human being so near a beast is potentially a son of God.

The Christian ethic accepts the full paradox of existence. It recognizes universal sin, but it does not accept this sin as determinative or as final. Instead it always keeps its eye on the way out. It makes the dignity of man and the sacredness of his personality the touchstone of personal and institutional conduct, not because man is like that now, but because God made him to become like that. The Christian ethic assumes the possibility of change. It anticipates improvement. It knows that a man can be made over, that he can be born again. But it also knows that because of man's very nature the changes that are desired can never be effected primarily through coercion. Man's potentialities can only be genuinely realized when he exercises his faculties freely, when he acts because he responds voluntarily, and when he participates because he really wants to do so.

Reversion under Tyranny

Under tyranny man's potentialities can never be realized. On the contrary, the essentially human in him tends to disappear and there is a rapid reversion from man to beast. This is a fact of immense significance, and one from which we can derive considerable comfort during these dark days. Over the run of years it is men and not beasts who will govern human affairs. The beast is incapable of the sustained effort required. He is utterly incapable of providing the moral cohesion without which the most formidable societies disintegrate and collapse. It is true that for a brief period the tyrant, capitalizing on human qualities in the masses of the people which he inherited and did not create, can mobilize immense striking power to destroy the civilization of his day. But the tyrant's hour of glory and triumph will be brief if free men rise to challenge him. And even if there were no free men left, his decline and fall would be none the less inevitable. The story of the Spartans is a perfect record of the curse which God and nature pronounce upon men who lose their human qualities through an attempt to regulate and fashion personal life by external coercion. A similar curse is falling in our time upon the Nazis and the War Lords of Japan. The handwriting is on the wall. Their doom is sure. The free peoples of the world can hasten the day of doom for these evil men by their resolute action, but no power on earth could postpone that day indefinitely, however great the effort might be.

The genius of the Christian ethic is that it draws out the good from within man by confidence in his potential integrity. While fully recognizing the extent of man's limitations and of his sin, it creates an atmosphere of fundamental sympathy and trust essential to men's spiritual and mental growth.

Democracy from one standpoint is a faltering attempt to provide forms of government through which individuals will have an opportunity to express the Christian ethic. It seems to be the political system under which that ethic has the best chance to operate. Democracy is the answer of the Christian citizen to tyranny.

What is political democracy? By democracy I mean the form of government derived from the belief that the good of all persons should constitute the touchstone of public policy with that good determined by representatives chosen in free elections.

During the years when we took democracy for granted as the coming government of mankind, it was perhaps natural that democracy was defined in terms of its mechanics. Now we realize that our democracy can no more be taken for granted than our humanity. Every quality in human life that represents growth from beast to man has been acquired, and begins to be lost the moment it is taken for granted. All of these qualities have been won by work, by sacrifice and by prayer, and when effort relaxes or faith falters, they tend to disappear.

The Mechanics of Democracy

The mechanics of democracy may, however, be taken as useful points of departure for exploring its deeper meaning and significance. We ordinarily think of democracy in terms of (1) the ballot, (2) the representative assembly, (3) the removable executive, (4) the independent judiciary, (5) the Bill of Rights for persons, and in short (6) government to facilitate the voluntary cooperation and participation of citizens rather than to impose the arbitrary and tyrannical will of the State.

The question at once arises why were these particular methods of government devised? The answer is clearly discernible in the purposes which the methods adopted were supposed to serve. The representative form of government as we know it in the United States is based on the conviction that the person is the end of human society—not race or class or state, but the person. In turn the person is assumed to be rational. The function of society then is to enhance the value of personal life by rational processes.

Use of the democratic process does not, of course, imply that man is wholly rational or that he is capable of perfection. That is an error into which the Utopians have fallen and from which we have suffered grievously in recent years. The Protestant perfectionists in America are at one with the disciples of Rousseau and of Marx in having betrayed democracy by their false estimate of human nature. Because of their unrealistic views, they have insisted upon public policies such as the Kellogg Pact, which were doomed to frustration and which have created

wide-spread disillusion and cynicism as their futility has become apparent.

The inevitable reaction to this utopianism is fascism—the flight from reason. The fascists assume that the mass of mankind is thoroughly irrational and must be treated as one would treat articulate monkeys.

It is, of course, obvious that there is not a great deal of rationality lying about in any one community. Whatever the future may hold in store in this respect, as far as our time is concerned, the fund of reason upon which we can draw seems to be strictly limited. Be that as it may, the meaning of democracy is derived from the fact that it makes its appeal to reason, that it encourages the individual to use his mind, that it assumes man capable of more rationality than he appears to possess, and that it stakes its existence upon its success in stimulating the rational faculties and drawing upon latent rational resources which have not yet been utilized. Are we to continue to appeal to reason or are we to base our hope for mankind on irrational mysticism? That is one of the issues over which the world war in which we are now fully engaged is being fought.

The mechanics of the democratic system permit this appeal to reason. They constitute a due process of policy-making based on the assumption that the people themselves must argue the matter out, make up their minds, and reach a decision. That is the meaning of election campaigns, of voting and of the Congress. The fact that this "due process" sometimes works very poorly, the fact that it often seems terribly inefficient, the fact that so frequently decisions taken are "too little and too late"—none of these facts challenge the validity of the process. They merely reflect the limitations of the citizens who use the process. The validity of the process itself depends upon the nature of man and upon the nature of God. Does the process enhance the value of personal life? Is it the best means so far devised of permitting men to realize the political purposes for which they were created? Does it provide in the long run the surest guarantee that men may have a chance to mould public policy by the requirements of the Christian ethic? It is by these criteria that the process must be judged.

Reason Not the Final Court

The democratic system makes its appeal to reason. Greek democracy did that and failed. French democracy also made its appeal to reason and failed. The democratic systems of Athens and of the French Revolution were essentially rationalistic. Some element seemed to be lacking to give them survival value.

The fact is that reason by itself is not enough to insure that democratic forms produce a democratic way of life. As the controlling factor in the organization of society reason can be as full of pride and as inclined to the use of terror as the mystical irration-

alism of Berchtesgaden. If the democratic way of life is to have a chance to survive and to express itself more effectively its appeal to reason must be modified by the Christian view of man and of society.

It follows from the Christian doctrine of sin that no man is good enough or great enough or wise enough to be trusted with absolute power to govern. According to our American procedure the people at regular intervals have the opportunity to return their governors to private life. But an even more important provision in our Constitution is the system of checks and balances between the three branches of government, which make it impossible for one branch of government to establish complete dominance over the others. The sinful nature of man makes these checks and balances necessary in order to preserve liberty for the people.

It also follows from the Christian view of man that public policy must be judged by its effect upon personal life. The American Constitution vests the ultimate power of government in the people. But it does not do this because of any mystical theory of the divine right of the mass. It does so because it regards the individual person as the end of government. Hence, a Bill of Rights to insure that in certain important areas of life, the citizen has an existence of his own outside of, and independent of, the authority of the State. The Bill of Rights from one standpoint is really a Bill of Reason. It is a guarantee that men will be free to use their minds in writing, in speaking, and in the worship of God. But from the point of view of the Christian ethic, the assertion of rights is only justified if citizens are equally eager to recognize and perform their duties. The Constitution, of course, says little or nothing about duties. And perhaps that is just as well. Because, though law can force men to obey the State, it cannot create in their hearts and wills a sense of obligation to their fellows and to society. The sense of obligation which makes men want to serve their day and generation springs from inner sources of faith which the State cannot give and cannot take away. Yet the survival of the democratic way of life depends as much upon men who are conscious of their duties as upon men who insist upon their rights.

It is apparent, therefore, that if democracy's appeal to reason has to be modified by the Christian view of man, this modification must express itself in the attitudes of individual citizens as well as in the mechanisms of government. Due process of policy-making depends upon the ability of people to listen as well as to talk, to learn as well as to instruct, to change their views as well as to persist in them, and reason alone cannot provide these aptitudes. If I had to mention one quality that seemed to me to be the very essence of the democratic process I would mention the capacity to hear what others are saying and inwardly digest

its meaning. To do that truly requires the grace of God.

Reason and Motive Power

Nor does reason give men the power to act. That depends upon how much men believe and in what. The western world is strewn with the debris of successive cataclysms which caught men unprepared and incapable of decision because they cared for nothing well enough to die for it. The liberalism of the 19th century which created agnosticism toward man as well as toward God has much to answer for. Some identified this liberalism with democracy. Fortunately, events have helped us to distinguish between the two in time to save the latter. Every day's news drives home the truth that reason without faith is as impotent as faith without reason is false.

It is apparent that the democratic process relies directly upon the Christian view of man to provide the conditions necessary for public debate to be carried through to a decision compatible with the commonweal.

Our argument leads to certain conclusions which I believe can be confirmed to some extent by the history of the democratic movement and its relations to the Christian community. Democracy is not Christianity but it depends upon Christianity. Tendencies toward democratic forms of government will appear wherever the Christian faith is a living reality in the hearts of the people. Where the Christian faith disappears, the democratic faith will also disappear and in due course democratic institutions will follow suit. Again, if democratic institutions are replaced by a totalitarian tyranny in a country where there has been a Christian community, the only form of Christianity that can survive publicly will be a perverted form.

At the same time it is important to remember that no form of human society can be labeled Christian in the sense of its being a perfect expression of the requirements of the Christian ethic. This applies to democracy as well as to any other governmental system. Democracy is not the political expression of the Christian ethic. But societies can be graded according to their compatibility with the requirements of the Christian ethic. And this much can be said, that of all the forms of society yet devised by man, the democratic form is negatively least incompatible with the Christian ethic, and positively most congenial to its public expression. Further, it is evident that democratic institutions and a free Christian church are so closely related that the fate of each hangs upon the other. This means that the Christian community as a Christian community has an immense stake in the outcome of the present conflict between tyrants and democratic governments. To say that the Church can remain indifferent to the issues of this war or must be serenely detached in the presence of the

struggle is equivalent to saying either that the Christian ethic is not true or that it was not intended to be used as a yardstick for judging the policies of nations.

If America means anything at all it means a society dedicated to the enhancement of the value of personal life. American destiny is related to the destiny of persons—of all persons everywhere. That is our job. That is the task that we are being called upon to undertake in this fateful hour of human history. We are not being assigned this task because of any virtue in ourselves or of any superior wisdom or ability. It is being assigned to us because in God's Providence, we happen to have inherited both the tradition of the Christian ethic and of the democratic way of life. Each of these great traditions places an obligation upon us which we cannot escape. Together they are beginning to define for us our world-wide mission.

A Voice from the Past

THE following extract from a sermon preached by the Reverend Samuel Davies on January 1, 1757, at Hanover, Virginia, before a Company of Virginia soldiers about to depart for the French and Indian War, has relevance for our own day.

"Brethren, while we are surrounded with the terrors of war, let us learn our own degeneracy, mourn over it, and cry for the exertion of that power which alone can form us anew, and repair these wastes and desolations. The present war indeed . . . is unavoidable; and consequently our duty. But how corrupt must this world be, when peace itself, the sweetest of all blessings, is become an evil, and war is chosen before it? When it is become our duty to shed blood, when martial valor, or courage to destroy man, who was made in the image of God, is become a virtue? When it has become glorious to kill men! and when we are obliged to treat a whole nation as a gang of robbers and murderers, and bring them to judgment? This certainly shows that they are degenerated creatures; and as they share in the same nature with us, we must draw the same conclusion concerning ourselves. Let us therefore humble ourselves, and mourn in dust and ashes before the Lord; and let us lament the general depravity of the world."

One of the most eloquent preachers of the colonial period, Samuel Davies was the heart and center of the Presbyterian phase of the Colonial revival in Virginia. Young Patrick Henry sat under his preaching and took him as his model of eloquence. Samuel Davies became the fourth President of Princeton in 1761.

Books on Post-War Reconstruction

AS ministers will be dealing increasingly with problems of post-war reconstruction, the following list of books may prove of value to them:

World Economy in Transition by Eugene Staley, *The Reconstruction of World Trade* by J. B. Condliffe, and *Economic Bases of a Durable Peace*, by J. E. Meade are among the best treatises on the economic problems of world reconstruction.

William Rappard's *The Quest for Peace Since the World War* is a good historical introduction to present problems. Raymond Leslie Buell's *Isolated America* deals particularly with the issue of America's relation to a new world order. Among the proponents of Federal Union, Clarence Streit's *Union Now* and W. B. Curry's *The Case for Federal Union* are best known. Streit's *Union Now With Britain* brings his thesis up to date. The European problem is considered especially in Alfred Bingham's *The United States of Europe* and in W. Ivor Jennings's *A Federation of Western Europe*. The best discussion of the Pacific problem is Nathaniel Pfeffer's *Prerequisites to Peace in the Far East*. John Foster Dulles' *War, Peace and Change* is an excellent analysis of the basic principles which must underlie a new world order. Oscar Newfang's *World Federation*

treats the larger issues of world organization. P. E. Corbett's *Post-War Worlds* is a measured and careful analysis and criticism of various proposals for a new world order.

W. E. Paton's *The Church and the New World Order* is one of the few treatises on the general subject written specifically from a Christian point of view. It is not, however, in any sense "sectarian" and may well be read as an introduction to all the other literature in the field.

Two books which deal with the relation of America to foreign affairs have just been published. They are of great value in understanding the contradictory impulses toward isolationism and expansionism in American foreign policy. The first, *America in World Affairs*, is an historical analysis of the past decades by the historian Allan Nevins. The second, *America and World Mastery*, by the journalist, John MacCormac, analyzes British-American relations with wit and wisdom and argues for a new League of Nations under Anglo-American hegemony. He thinks that if we should withdraw once more from world responsibility, Britain would have to make the attempt to bring order into European affairs by a straight Anglo-German alliance, strange as such a suggestion may seem.

The World Church: News and Notes

Address by Lord Halifax

In an address given by Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, on February 2nd before the Church Club of New York, he declared:

"... The responsibility placed upon the individual citizen under the democratic system is seen in close analogy with the responsibility vested in him under the moral law. Man is endowed with the gift of free will, of which admittedly he not seldom makes disastrous use. From God's point of view, if we may reverently so speak, these unhappy results of man's freewill might have been avoided if man had not been so endowed. But freewill, with all the risks of its misuse, is, so far as we can judge, the deliberate method chosen by God, in order to make possible the great results of the right use of freewill, which could never be open to man were he the mere creature of mechanical necessity with no power of choice.

"And thus—though of course in the application of these eternal principles to the practical life of man there must always be adjustments and regard to considerations of time and circumstance—I always feel, when I hear people say 'Good government is better than self-government,' that does not appear to be the way that God has chosen to direct the affairs of the human race—affairs

of infinitely greater importance than those dealt with by any earthly government.

"But this conception of the value of every human soul that finds political expression in democracy, and to preserve which we are prepared today to make every sacrifice, must, if we are true to our principles, constantly seek to reflect itself in the essential life of every community that wishes in whatever form or degree to claim for itself the name of Christian.

"We must be constantly on guard to see that human values that affect the lives of men are not submerged and strangled by some economic law that ought to be men's servant rather than their master. . . ."

Protestants Suffer in Spain

Protestant ministers of the gospel are suffering great distress in Spain. Contrary to Franco's promises during the civil war, Protestant churches have not been permitted to reopen and all Protestant schools have been closed. Attendance at Catholic mass is obligatory for all soldiers and civil employees of the Government. This kind of compulsory religion will generate a terrible spirit of resentment in due time. When the reaction sets in we will be told that the rebels are animated by the devil, and that nothing less could explain their animus against the Sacred Church.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
HELEN LANE ROBERTS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

The Alternative to Totalitarianism

The following extracts from a letter written by Mr. Christopher Dawson and published by the *Christian News-Letter* contain a clear analysis of the problems which Christians in Great Britain are facing today.

"I am more and more impressed with the magnitude of the problems which confront us today in the conflict between our culture and the totalitarian systems, and with the danger of the disintegration of British society under the pressure of total war and totalitarian propaganda. It is clear that unless we can preserve the distinctive values of our society against these adverse forces, military success against Germany would be of little value; moreover, I believe that it will only be possible to achieve military success, if we find a solution of this spiritual or ideological problem, and make our own people and the world clearly conscious of the real nature of our cause.

"The trouble is that, since our case is not a party one and since it even transcends the national tradition, it has no ready-made label or program. We are agreed that the spiritual values of Christianity and political, social and personal freedom are at stake. But our society is not Christian in the absolute sense, and much harm can be caused by a false identification of them. The accepted solution is to term our cause that of democracy, and a good case can be made for the use of the word, but it is not wholly satisfactory and is open to several grave objections.

"(a) Historically democracy is not an English tradition. English constitutionalism and parliamentarism were liberal rather than democratic, while English society was aristocratic and individualist. Modern democracy is mainly French and American, and the first modern regime—that of the Jacobins—was definitely totalitarian and suffered from many of the evils which we are opposing in the modern totalitarian states. American democ-

racy has, of course, much more affinity with English ideals, but that is because it has been profoundly influenced by English liberalism and is, in fact, liberal democracy.

"(b) Morally, democracy is weak, just at the points that are most in need of defense at the present time. It involves (or at least permits) the lowering down of standards to a level which is acceptable to everybody, and it is, partly for this reason, very ready to accept a crudely materialist form of secular culture.

"(c) It is exposed to the danger of disintegration, owing to its lack of authority and discipline. Here England has been strong enough to serve the continental democracies and to resist totalitarian aggression, just because it was not purely democratic.

"Hence the danger that, if we accept democracy as our standard and slogan, we shall destroy the sources of our real strength, and lose the values which are an essential part of our national tradition."

British Chaplains

The religious editor of the *Manchester Guardian* recently reported: "The work of the chaplains (in the British army and navy) is distinctly better than in the last war and is of a distinctly high quality. Again and again the lads in the army, navy and air force have spoken to me of the work of the chaplains and of the way it is appreciated by the men."

Dutch S. C. M. Dissolves

As a protest against the anti-Semitic laws which the German occupation is applying to all free associations, the Student Christian movement of Holland has dissolved itself. It was not willing to exclude Jews from its membership.

Catholics and Protestants Protest

It has become known that a Roman Catholic Bishop and a Protestant Bishop joined in a protest to the German government. They carried their message personally to government headquarters, enumerated the many cases of persecution, suppression of schools, and all the other State interferences with the normal church life of the country. They asked the Government to state plainly whether it was the intention to continue with this policy of repression. They declared that silence upon the part of the Government with regard to this protest would be construed as suggesting that the policy would continue. They stated that in such an eventuality they would be obliged to inform all the faithful that they must be prepared for further persecution. It is not known what the Government has done about this protest.

Author in this Issue

Mr. Francis P. Miller was formerly president of the World Student Christian Federation and more recently the vice-chairman of the Fight for Freedom Committee. He is at present the Organizing Director of the Council of Foreign Relations, Inc.

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.